

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/388,935

Applicant(s)

MIYAWAKI ET AL. #20

Examiner

John W Hayes

Art Unit

3621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John W Hayes.

(3) _____.

(2) Yong Choi.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 June 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bowman et al, Dillon, Downs et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed recitations in the claims related to displaying summary information only if decoding information accompanying encrypted contents can be utilized by the user. Mr. Choi indicated that he believes the prior art does not show this feature. Examiner agreed to consider applicant's arguments when received in the forthcoming response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

John W. Hayes
Examiner's signature, if required